

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/439,416

Applicant(s)
Guenther

Examiner
Dionne Harvey

Group Art Unit
2643



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dionne Harvey

(3) Sinh Tran (Primary Examiner)

(2) Michael Falkoff (Reg. No. 30,833)

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jul 12, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Watkins (US 3,838,216) and Hastings-James (US 4,300,022)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The attorney agreed that the claims, as presented in papers 1-10, are anticipated by the Watkins reference. More specifically, the attorney acknowledges that elements 10 and 16 of the Watkins reference represent "...wire coils being directly connected in parallel..." (as illustrated in figure 2 and disclosed in column 4, lines 0-12.) The final rejection set forth in paper no. 11, is agreed to be proper. The Attorney stated that the prior office actions did not clearly point out those elements which were stated to anticipate the immediate invention. The Examiner and Primary Examiner, Sinh Tran revisited the prior rejections with the Attorney and maintained that all prior rejections clearly indicated those elements which were believed to anticipate the immediate invention in Office Action sections which addressed the applicable prior art references and sections which addressed the Applicant's arguments of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Dionne Harvey
7/16/01

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.